Citizen Information Network (CIN) - Project 1 Meeting
August 19, 1997 ▪ 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
US Department of Veterans Affairs, Room 975
Federal Building, 210 Walnut (9th Floor) ▪ Des Moines, Iowa

ICN Remote Sites
Cedar Falls — Cedar Falls High School ▪ **Cedar Rapids** — Kirkwood Community College
Sioux City — Western Iowa Community College ▪ **Vinton** — Iowa Braille and Sight Saving School
Washington DC — US General Services Administration

Project Team Present
Tom Armitage, *Cedar Rapids Public Library*
Norman Baker, *IPERS*
Bob Canney, *Black Hawk County Auditor*
Paul Coates, *ISU Extension Service*
Lee Duin, *Polk County Treasurer's Office*
Pat Gill, *Woodbury County Auditor and Recorder*
Randy Hertz, *Hertz Family Farm Services*
Steve Moon, *University of Northern Iowa*
Linda Plazak, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Lowell Sneller, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Don Toms, *Iowa Department of Transportation*
Dennis Thurman, *Iowa Braille School*

Guest
Dave Arringdale, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Monty Bertelli, *Secretary of State's Office*
Jim Day, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Diane Kolmer, *IowAccess Citizen Council*
Jim Youngblood, *Iowa Information Technology Services*

Staff
Amy Campbell, *State Public Policy Group*

Introductions
Norman Baker and Linda Plazak introduced themselves and two new members - Lee Duin, Polk County Treasurer's Office, and Pat Gill, Woodbury County Auditor and Recorder.

Partner Team Presentation
Linda Plazak updated the team on the progress of the Partner Team - which was charged with reviewing options for the creation of the Citizen Information Network (CIN)

infrastructure. Plazak briefed the team on last week's meetings with Kansas (which is referred to as the "network manager approach") and WINGS. Plazak noted that the minutes to those meetings were e-mailed last week, and are in the packets for today. The team which met with the network manager approach and the WINGS approach include: Norman Baker, Bob Canney, Glen Dickinson, Doug Kern, Harry McDaniel, Steve Moon, Linda Plazak, Jean Rommes, Lowell Sneller, and Jack Whitmer. Team members from Project 6 (Housing) and Project 4 (Internet training) also had members attending these sessions. A subgroup of the Steering Committee, Citizen Council, Technical experts, and key department officials also met separately with the two models. All together, over 50 people participated in the five sessions with WINGS and the network manager model.

Plazak reviewed the CIN Framework again - and reminded the team that the CIN must continue to reflect this framework and the criteria established by the team prior to exploring the WINGS and network manager models.

Norman Baker suggested that Option 3 be restated to read:

- *Put out an RFP for a sustainable system that meets the needs of the IowAccess projects and allows for future growth to an intergovernmental network.*

This rewording received the consensus of the team. The team asked if the RFP should recommend DOT and Secretary of State participation. The team agreed that this is not necessary - because we want to have a number of different responses to the RFP. The vendors will tell us if they require the participation of certain agencies.

- *The team asked that the RFP be worded flexibly and allow for a future partnership with WINGS.*

Plazak stated that WINGS does not currently have many of their services operational - and they may not be a viable solution at this time. However, when they do begin to offer authentication, encryption, and electronic payments, the team wants to make sure that the system is compatible with WINGS. WINGS will have payment capability in November, and authentication in the first quarter of 1998 (sometime before April 1998).

The team asked that the following be added to the RFP evaluation criteria:

- *Capability of a statewide presence.*

The team requested that the RFP solicit approaches to funding - but not outline how a vendor should finance the system.

Bill Morgan and Paul Coates cautioned the group about allowing vendors to take a proprietary approach to the system - and requiring the state to rely on them as the only alternative in the future.

- *The RFP should be constructed as an open and flexible system, so that the state will not be locked into a particular model, and the vendor given control over the network.*

2

Diane Kolmer emphasized that the RFP should make sure that the CIN criteria are the priority for the system - and that the scale of the solution be examined in detail. Any solution considered should not be proprietary, but supported by a number of vendors.

The team agreed that ITS should continue to negotiate with WINGS - and that participation in the future be considered. The team agreed that an approach that considers the back-end first (the state side of the system) and the front end (the gateway) second is the most appropriate for IowAccess.

Norman Baker suggested that Option 4 be restated to read:

- *Continue to negotiate an MOU with the US Postal Service, which allows Iowa citizens and governments to evaluate the WINGS project.*

The team came to consensus on revision. The team asked Jim Youngblood to negotiate with WINGS to eliminate as many transaction fees as possible.

RFP Criteria

Project 1 set 16 criteria for the Citizen Information Network - and did this prior to being approached by WINGS and the network manager approach. In addition, the team constructed a framework for the CIN. This information was used as the baseline for the draft RFP criteria, which Jim Day distributed. Day reviewed the RFP criteria for those connected via the ICN.

The team asked if they were to address issues of privacy, and whether that should be a question asked in the RFP. Jim Youngblood answered that there are really three different issues related to privacy that are considerations for the CIN:

- Security (making sure the data is secure and can not be accessed by unauthorized parties)
- Confidentiality (only authorized people can access certain information)
- Data integrity (the information is accurate and updated)

Diane Kolmer stated that the Citizens Council's primary concern is privacy, access, and security. Plazak stated that the CIN Project 1 will need to look at each of these issues from an overall IowAccess perspective, because no other projects will be doing that.

- *The team asked that the RFP ask for responses to how often information and data will be updated, the procedure, and refresh schedule.*

The team discussed what was meant by "self-sustaining." The team defined this as a system that is not tied to a single, proprietary solution and generates sufficient revenues to support the operation and growth of the system. The team agreed that the system can not rely on legislative appropriations, but discussed the need to include "savings achieved" by the implementation of these projects as a self-sustaining mechanisms. Coates warned that the team should not consider savings as way to sustain the system, because savings is transitory issue. Appropriations will be cut to reflect the savings - savings is not necessarily reinvested in the system.

Kolmer added that the team risks the viability of the IowAccess projects if the Legislature is expected to provide ongoing funding for the system. Ultimately, the system will need to show sustainability that will gain favor and credibility with the Legislature.

Sustainability should have a very high value in the RFP - but Kolmer cautioned that the team keep an open mind in reviewing RFPs and understand the functionality of the approach. Kolmer stated that the team may have to choose an inferior vendor if cost is the highest priority factor. The team agreed that costs should be secondary to what the system can do. The team agreed that function - not cost - should drive the selection of the vendor.

The team stressed the need to accommodate legacy systems in the transition period, and make sure that whatever model is chosen, that interoperability be a high priority.

Monty Bertelli asked the team to consider adding words that would encourage voluntary agency participation. The team stressed that it has no authority to mandate participation of any agency - and that decision is at a much higher level than on the team.

- *The team asked that the RFP be reworded from "permit 800 number access" to "provide 800 number access."*

The team asked that the RFP team consider addressing help desks and incorporate the potential connection to WINGS.

Jim Day asked for any input on the criteria be emailed, phoned, or faxed to him at:

Email: jday@max.state.ia.us   Phone: 515/281-5061   Fax: 515/281-6137

Once the RFP is completed, it will be faxed and emailed out to everyone. Responses will be expected soon after - because the team wants to make sure it keeps to its timeline. The other project teams are depending on this.

Standards

Linda Plazak distributed an initial, draft version of the IowAccess "Standards." These are being referred to as "Guidelines" instead of standards, because they more appropriately are guidelines for interoperability. Plazak asked that the Team review these, which were developed with the assistance of the Project Team 1 Standards Subcommittee (Jean Rommes, and Lowell Sneller), and send comments back to her as soon as possible. Plazak can be reached at:

Email: lplazak@max.state.ia.us Phone: 515/281-6778   Fax: 515/281-6137

The guidelines currently do not address midrange systems - but this is in the works. Jim Day asked the team to forward any vendor names to him - and he will make sure they get a copy of the RFP once completed.

Dennis Thurman asked if the systems reviewed incorporate accessibility options. Plazak stated that the WINGS approach incorporates a number of accommodations, and that this is in the CIN criteria. Thurman cautioned that "accessibility" means writing things in a

way which can be understood by everyone. Plazak stated that she would contact WINGS to obtain their adaptive models.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:10 pm.